

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/549,946		FELDER ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	NAVIN NATNITHITHADHA		3735	

All Participants:

(1) NAVIN NATNITHITHADHA.

(2) Jonathan D. Link.

Date of Interview: 13 November 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Objection of claim 22; and 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claims 22, 23, 25-29, 33, 35, and 38

Claims discussed:

22

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: Response after Non-Final Rejection

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 9:00 am

/Navin Natnithithadha/
Examiner, Art Unit 3735

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities: In lines 1-2, the claim has a typographical error by reciting "subject subject". Claim(s) 22, 23, 25-29, 33, 35, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter because these claims are method or process claims that do not transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing, nor are they tied to a particular machine. Applicant's representative and Examiner agreed to a proposed amendment to overcome the objection and the rejection above. .